

REMARKSClaim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakshi et al. (US 6,772,200) in view of Petty et al. (US 6, 342,907).

For a §103 obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. MPEP 2143.

Claim 1 recites a method of parsing content received by at least one client coupled to a server, the method comprising “receiving, by at least one client, a parser from a server; reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client; and parsing the received content by said at least one client.”

Bakshi fails to disclose reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in the at least one client, as recited in Claim 1. On Page 4 of the Office Action dated February 28, 2006, Examiner even admits that “Bakshi is silent regarding: reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client.” However, Examiner asserts that Petty discloses a content parsing system parsing content for display at the client device, including reconstructing (i.e., rendering) the parser in a web browser operating in the at least one client. Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Petty into the system of Bakshi to generate the received content in a proper format for display to the user. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner’s contentions.

Although Examiner asserts that the motivation for the proposed modification is to generate the received content in a proper format for display to the user, Applicant respectfully submits that Petty does not suggest that this result is achieved by reconstructing a parser in a web browser operating in a client. Rather, Petty places the responsibility of the display on the specification language, “which defines tags that are used in similar fashion to those defined in Hypertext Markup Language (HTML), that allow a user to specify the exact location of components displayed in the panel.” (Col. 3, lines 25-30). Petty does not teach or otherwise suggest that reconstructing a parser in a web browser operating in a client will help generate received content in a proper format for display to the user.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or incentive that would motivate one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Bakshi to include the step of reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in the client.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Bakshi in view of Petty.

Since Claims 2-13 depend from Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-13 are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 1.

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 14 as well.

Since Claims 15-23 depend from Claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15-23 are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 14.

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 24 as well.

Since Claims 25-33 depend from Claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 25-33 are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 24.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: April 28, 2006

/jonathan d. hanish/

Jonathan D. Hanish
Reg. No.: 57,821

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
1657 Hwy. 395, Suite 202
Minden, NV 89423
(775) 586-9500
(775) 586-9550 Fax